

27th August 1926] [Mr. T. M. Narasimhaiah]

more quickly. I quite see the solicitude on the part of the hon. Minister for the staff of local boards. They also want some rest, but I submit that very few clerks only are required on meeting days. It is only one or two clerks who are in charge of the meeting work that will be called for and if necessary they will be given compensation leave, i.e., if they work on a holiday, generally they are given compensation leave on some other day. We do not lose sight of that fact. Therefore my request to the hon. the Chief Minister is to alter the first portion in such a way as to provide that no meeting shall be held on a Sunday except when the meeting is to be continued on a Sunday with the consent of the members present."

Mr. T. M. MOIDU SAHIB :—"Not only on Sundays, but also on all Government holidays."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—"Mr. President, Sir, I quite see that there is some force in the argument advanced by the hon. Member for Cuddapah, but I think I can easily answer the argument. The difficulty pointed out by the hon. Member is only in the case of meetings held on Saturdays and not on other days or other holidays. But when once a change is made and the boards are acquainted with the change, they will take care that on meetings convened on Saturdays they will not have a heavy programme of work. So, the objection urged by the hon. Member is not a serious one and it is left to the boards themselves to see that on such days there is a light programme. In these circumstances, I am sorry I cannot accept the proposal made by my hon. Friend."

"Again, Sir, the hon. Member for Malabar requested me to extend this to other holidays, but as I stated already, this decision was arrived at as a matter of compromise. I cannot accept his proposal."

The resolution was put to the House and carried.

# V

## THE MALABAR TENANCY BILL.

\* The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—"So far as the Government are concerned, there is no objection to proceed with the non-official business if the House so desires."

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Three days have been allotted for non-official business. It is now 5 minutes after 4 and we may take it for all practical purposes as 4 o'clock and counting one hour for this day, three days will suffice for non-official business. I suppose, there is no objection to that."

\* The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—"No objection."

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"The first thing for consideration is the preamble; section 1, section 2, the definition section, and sections 4 and 5 have then to be considered. We have finished section 3 and we have amendments to clause 1, clause 2 which deals with definitions and clauses 4 and 5. Amendments have already been tabled and we have also some amendments to clauses which have already been passed. I suggest, Sir, that it would be convenient to everybody concerned that we take up clauses 4 and 5 first and then clause 1 and then dispose of the amendments to clauses

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[27th August 1926]

which have already been passed and then go finally to the definition and to the preamble. My friend the hon. Mr. Moir who is in charge of the Bill, I suppose, has no objection to the course."

\* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"No objection."

*Clause 4.*

\* Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—"I beg to move

*that the following clause be substituted for the existing one :—*

*"Nothing in this Act shall affect kanam holdings of which the kanam amount is more than the aggregate of 12 years' michavaram."*

"My main argument is this, Sir: It has been said that all kanams that partake the character of mortgage or hypothecation must be excluded. The supporters of the Bill expressed that the kanams in North Malabar were very heavy and are more or less mortgages and on that ground they should be excluded."

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"May I have a word of personal explanation, Sir? I have not stated that the kanams in North Malabar are heavy and therefore should be excluded. I said that kanams in North Malabar do not partake of the characteristics of kanams in South Malabar and that the kanams in North Malabar are really mortgages and therefore they should be excluded. The exclusion has no relation whatever to the amount of kanam."

\* Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—"That is exactly what I also meant. If I did not explain myself properly, it was my fault. It is said that kanams that are of the character of mortgages did not require any special treatment and that they might be excluded. We have also got heavy kanams in South Malabar and so I have suggested that the kanam amount which is more than the aggregate of twelve years' michavaram or the annual rent payable to the janmi may be excluded from the provisions of the Act. Even when we purchase janmam property the value that we pay is only twenty years' purchase, and twelve times the michavaram may fairly be taken to indicate a mortgage and treated as a liability or an encumbrance on the property. Therefore I have suggested that such kanams may be excluded from the scope of this Act."

\* Mr. V. MADHAVA RAJA :—"I second it."

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Now, we are concerned with the kanam amounts in respect of two classes of kanams, those kanams which have been in existence for a long time irrespective of the amount and those kanams which came into existence within seventy-three years. We have included within the scope of the Act persons who are holders of old kanams, i.e., old kanamdars whose kanams came into existence about three quarters of a century ago, and who have occupancy rights and permanent tenure. If the amendment is carried, it is practically taking away with one hand what is given by the other, that is, repealing a major portion of what has been already passed by the Council. So far as the nature of the transactions is concerned, kanams have distinct characteristics, distinct from ordinary mortgages."



27th August 1926]

\* Mr. V. MADHAVA RAJA :—" It is said that in North Malabar the kanams are heavy and that kanam is only a mortgage there. There are so many kanam holdings with heavy kanams in South Malabar also. Therefore kanam holdings in South Malabar mentioned in the amendment should also be treated in the same way as those in North Malabar. I therefore strongly support Mr. Tampan's amendment."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON :—" It is impossible to support the motion made by Mr. Tampan. As a matter of fact, from the discussions we have had with reference to this measure only two classes of kanams were formulated, that is, kanams which have their origin before 1852 and kanams that have their origin after 1854 without reference to the amounts which were mentioned in the document. A third set is sought to be introduced by Mr. Tampan and we do not know exactly where we would be if, as a matter of fact, this additional category is also introduced. There may be kanams which are a little more than twelve years' multiple of michavaram but which were as a matter of fact created before 1852 and we shall be taking away the rights conferred by section 6 if this amendment is carried. I therefore strongly oppose the amendment moved by Mr. Tampan."

\* Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—" It has been admitted even by my hon. Friends opposite that for the last hundred years and odd, kanams have been treated only as mortgages whether rightly or wrongly. It was therefore but natural for people in Malabar, to have raised large sums as kanams and treated the transaction purely as a mortgage. That was the law and nothing prevented them from treating them as only ordinary mortgages. There are janmis, even well-to-do janmis, who have raised very large sums as kanams. I referred the other day to a document which I came across which was executed by the Kizhake Kovilagam, the richest janmi in Malabar, raising a kanam of about Rs. 14,000. How it came to be, I cannot say, but it is a fact. A janmi in want only raises a loan on his property before he sells it outright. In many other rich families also owing to adverse circumstances or to meet pressing demands very large sums have been raised as kanams and they are treated only as loans. You will find several cases in my documents. Mr. Krishnan Nayar's complaint was that it was a mistake to have treated these kanams as mortgages. When a janmi and his tenant treated the kanam only as a mortgage, why should it not be excluded from the operation of this Act."

" Sir, in the working of the Act also there will be formidable difficulties. 4-15  
As an instance, I may point out that the renewal fee provided in the Bill is p.m.  
is one year's net produce. Supposing a land fetches 1,000 paras of paddy. There may be a nominal kanam on that holding, say Rs. 100 or Rs. 150. There may be another case where a land that fetches a thousand paras of paddy might have Rs. 10,000 as kanam. So, both these holdings will have to pay the same rate of renewal fee. The man who has invested a larger amount in the shape of kanam makes only a nominal profit from the holding. In spite of that, he will have to pay the full year's net produce. It is an anomalous position. The Bill does not differentiate with reference to the payment of renewal fee between the man who has paid a nominal kanam on the holding and the man who has advanced a very large amount on the holding. That would be a real grievance and there are several other anomalies in the Bill. I only wanted to explain this aspect of the question. The House is welcome to vote one way or the other."

The amendment was put to the House and lost.

[27th August 1926]

• Paragraph 2. •

- \* Rao Bahadur P. RAMAN :—" I move, Sir,  
*'after the word "kuzhikanams" the words "or in leases of paddy lands" be inserted.'*

"I think, Sir, that leases of paddy lands should be treated on the same footing as kuzhikanams. When nominal kanams over kuzhikanams are not to be treated as kanams for the purpose of section 4, leases of paddy lands should also be treated in the same way. I hope the hon. Member, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, will accept the amendment. The reservation is by way of security for regular payment of rent in most cases."

- \* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I accept the amendment Sir."

\* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As there is no discussion, I will proceed to put the motion to the House."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 4 as amended was put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clause 5.

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Sir, I move the amendment that stands in my name. It runs as follows :—

*'In line 2 after the word "own" insert the words "on the date of the passing of this Act".'*

"As it stands, the clause reads :

*'Nothing in this Act shall apply to the janmam lands of janmis who own 10 acres or less of such lands under cultivation.'*

"With my amendment the clause will read thus :

*'Nothing in this Act shall apply to the janmam lands of janmis who own, on the date of the passing of this Act, 10 acres or less of such lands under cultivation.'*

"The object of this amendment, Sir, is this : This clause exempts from the operation of the provisions of this Bill the lands of those janmis who are small proprietors who own on the whole only 10 acres or less of janmam lands. In other words, the tenants of those janmis who own only 10 acres and less do not get occupancy right. Now, Sir, I want to fix this ownership of 10 acres as it exists on the date on which this Bill becomes law. Otherwise, anomalous consequences are likely to follow ; for, a janmi may possess on the date of the passing of this Act, say 15 acres. The result will be that all his tenants if not otherwise disentitled to occupancy right, will have occupancy right ; but the janmi may sell after the date on which this Bill becomes law 5 acres of his lands. Then he will have only 10 acres left. The result will be that all those tenants of his who till then had occupancy right in the 15 acres including the 10 acres left to the janmi, will lose their occupancy right. Such a result will lead to all sorts of anomalous consequences. On the other hand, Sir, if a janmi possesses 10 acres of land on the date of the passing of this Act, his tenants will not have occupancy right. If, afterwards he purchases one acre more and thereby becomes the owner of 11 acres, then all those tenants who had no occupancy right till then in these 10 acres will have occupancy right. So, the object of this amendment



27th August 1926] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

is to fix the ownership of 10 acres as it exists on the date of the passing of this Act and to prevent anomalous consequences for the future. I therefore move it."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON :—"I second the amendment."

\* Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—"I oppose it Sir. The concession given to the poor janmis is very niggardly, and therefore I object to this motion which aims at whittling down further. I have given amendments later on, Sir, to enlarge the concession; but that is a different matter. Sir, there is one hardship with regard to the suggestion made by Mr. Krishnan Nayar. Supposing a janmi family has got 100 acres of land on the date of the passing of this Act, they divide after the passing of this Act and that each divided branch of the family has got only 8 or 9 acres of land after the division. There may be 25 or 30 members in each family. Why should we not treat these several new families as coming under this clause, as they will then own only 10 acres and less? It may be that the original family holds more properties now, but owing the Malabar customs, the tarwad might not have cared to reduce the kanams. We, very often, find, Sir, that in janmi families there are a large number of members. I know of several families which have more than sixty or eighty members; and when they divide, they find it necessary to redeem their kanam properties and to make them into verumpattam. They must not be prevented from doing that. It will be a real injustice to the poor people. So, Sir, this restriction by way of introducing the date should not be accepted. Mr. Krishnan Nayar said a little while ago 'what is given by one hand is being taken away by the other.' I think it is more applicable here than to the case which he then referred to. I appeal to the House, Sir, that the cause of the poor janmis should be protected more than that of the big kanamdars. It is they that deserve kind protection at the hands of the Legislative Council. I therefore once more appeal to this Honourable House that they should deal generously with the poor janmis."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Sir, I also oppose this amendment. What is given with the right hand is taken away by the left hand. The amendment says: who own 10 acres or less on the date of the passing of this Act. A person purchases janmam lands of 10 acres or leases it after the Act. What is to be his position? Is that land to be subjected to the incidence of permanent right of occupancy and other calamities which are brought about by this Act? The real object of this section is to protect small janam holders. If that is so, I do not at all see any reason why it should be restricted to those persons who own 10 acres or less on the date of the passing of this Act. He mentioned another instance, Sir. Suppose a family partitions its property into 3 acres, 4 acres and 5 acres under an agreement among the members thereof. Each man will become a small owner. I fail to see why that small owner should not possess the janmam right, but should be subjected to the disabilities imposed by this Act. If the real object is to protect small holders, you must look to the spirit of it. Mr. Krishnan Nayar was speaking as if he was making a generous concession in the case of small holders. The Bill has gone through several stages, and this idea did not strike him all through. It strikes him only just now at the last moment and he now comes and adds the words 'on the date of the passing of this Act'. I think it is not treating the small holders with the generous spirit to which they are entitled."

[27th August 1926]

Rao Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"I support the amendment Sir. The object of the Bill is that all persons who are cultivating the lands whether or not they are janmis should have occupancy rights and that the Act should not be applicable to lands which are smaller in extent than 10 acres and which are under the actual cultivation of the janmi. Now, Sir, if the Act is not restricted to janmis other than those who own 10 acres or less on the date of the passing of this Act, the result will be this: supposing a janmi owns 20 acres to-day. All cultivators who are cultivating portions of those 20 acres will have occupancy rights under section 6. By some arrangement between brothers or relatives or friends, the janmi can divide his lands into bits of 10 acres or less and then he can come and say 'Under the Act you have no permanent right of occupancy as the extent of the land is less than 10 acres. I therefore drive you out'. The effect of it will be that every janmi will parcel out all the lands he has got into bits of less than 10 acres and say that the tenants' right of occupancy should be given up. What really section 5 states is: 'who own 10 acres or less of lands under cultivation.'"

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Janmam lands, not all lands."

Rao Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"Yes, janmam lands or lands to which janmis have a right of ownership. What section 5 says is that the Act shall not apply to the janmam lands of janmis who own 10 acres or less."

4-30  
P.m.

"Even if their lands become subdivided subsequently, the Act will not apply because section 5 simply says 'who own 10 acres or less'. But if you are going to say that the occupancy rights once conferred by this Act shall be taken away merely by the voluntary act of these people either by partition or otherwise, it will mean that what is given with one hand is taken away by the other. Certainly, this is not the object of the Act. My friend says 'purchase them subject to this condition.' I see no reason why one purchaser should get greater rights than what he bargains for. But supposing there is a partition; this Act may not affect it because that does not come under the purview of this Act. So, by partition they would not become lands in respect of which occupancy right can be had. On these grounds, Sir, I say that if you want to make any concession in respect of small janmams, they must be lands which on the date of the coming into force of this Act are 10 acres or less. I therefore support the amendment."

\* Mr. V. MADHAVA RAJA :—"I entirely agree with Mr. K. Prabbakaran Tampan. A janmi possessing 20 acres of land may divide it into bits of less than 10 acres. In that case, this section will not apply to such kanams. I think, Sir, the same protection which is afforded to him now should be extended to him then also. So I oppose this motion."

The amendment was put and carried.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Now that the previous amendment was passed, and the words 'on the date of the passing of this Act' have been added, I submit that a larger number of janmis should be kept outside the purview of this Act. I therefore propose, Sir, that

*'for the figure "10" the figure "100" be substituted'.*

"If it is intended that only people who own a certain number of acres of land for themselves on the date of the passing of this Act should be excluded, I think the extent of lands must be raised at least to 100 acres."



27th August 1926]

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I oppose that amendment Sir. This clause as it stands now was not in the original draft of the Bill. It was inserted by the Select Committee and in the Select Committee there was a good deal of discussion as to whether this clause as it now stands should find a place in the Bill. Some were of opinion that such a clause should not be put in at all; others were of opinion that if there was such a clause, it should be restricted to 5 acres and should not extend to 10 acres. After a great deal of discussion as a sort of compromise, 10 acres was ultimately adopted. There are those who think that 10 acres are too high and my Friend Mr. Raman's motion which was intended to delete this clause altogether had for its idea that object, but it was not moved. Certainly, anything more than 10 acres will deprive a large number of tenants of the fixity which it is intended to confer upon them. I therefore oppose the motion.”

\* Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“ Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Narasimhachari. I have also given notice of a similar motion. Ten acres are hardly sufficient for the needs of a small family. My Friend Mr. Raman Menon knows the case of the Kurup's family in Kalladi code which owns extensive properties of cultivable and forest lands. He pays Rs. 700 assessment but gets only an annual income of 175 paras of paddy. The lands in all will fetch more than 1,500 paras of paddy.”

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I may be excused for this interruption. May I ask whether he pays Rs. 700 or his tenants pay it.”

\* Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“ It may be that the payment is made through the tenants, but it is all his land. What I say is that it is not the extent of the land that should be treated as the standard for our purpose. There may be one acre of paddy land and 9 acres of parambas may be attached to it and there may be some garden also in it; and the janmi may get only a nominal income. The janmi may have to pay a large sum by way of the cost of improvement on the holding. Therefore, if you limit the extent of the land to 10 acres it will work as a great hardship on the poor janmis. In this connexion, Sir, I may invite the attention of the House to a report of the late Mr. Krishna Menon. He said in his report that 100 acres of land must be fixed as the minimum. This is what he said :

‘ That this restriction shall not extend to janmis whose janmam property, inclusive of ulu parambas (dry lands periodically cultivated) and kadu (forest lands), shall not exceed 100 acres.’

“ The provision itself does not differentiate between cultivable land and parambas. If a janmi has only 10 acres of parambas this will apply to him. Therefore the limit should be 100 acres and not 10 acres. I appeal to the expert member in the name of his revered father whose opinion I read now to have kind regard for the poor janmis. Another aspect of the question is this : You will remember, Sir, I tabled a motion saying that kanam lands that are more than 25 acres in extent ought to be excluded from the scope of the Bill on the ground that 25 acres are fairly sufficient for supporting a kanamdar's family. Then my friends, both the expert Member and the author of the Bill, said that 25 acres were not sufficient for the maintenance of a kanamdar's family. Now, let me not be misunderstood, with the tongues in their cheeks they are saying that 10 acres are sufficient for a janmi family. They ought to be fair both to the janmi and to the tenant if they want to be reasonable. There is no meaning in saying that in the case of the

[Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan] [27th August 1926]

janmi we should restrict it to 10 acres, but so far as the tenant is concerned it may be 100 acres or 1,000 acres. The House has got to consider everything on a fair basis. I leave it to the House to decide Sir."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON :—"I am sorry I have to differ from Mr. Tampan as I have very often to do. The chief argument put forward by him on this point is, first of all, that a janmi family with 10 acres of land as mentioned in this section will be hardly able to maintain itself, i.e., the income would not be sufficient for the family. I am astonished to find, that Mr. Tampan who has good experience of Malabar and who knows Malabar well, should support Mr. Narasimhacharlu, who admits, that he has absolutely no experience of Malabar. What does 100 acres of cultivable land, not dry land which is not cultivated at all, mean in Malabar? Hundred acres will mean in Malabar about 1,000 paras of seeds from the land for which according to the rate of assessment now prevalent in Malabar there will be an assessment of Rs. 750. Ordinarily our lands are taxed at Rs. 7-8-0 an acre and on that basis an assessment of Rs. 750 will have to be paid for 100 acres. At the same time, the yield of the land would be, if it is wet land, about 10,000 paras of paddy, i.e., nearly Rs. 10,000 worth of paddy. Now, Sir, I should like to ask Mr. Tampan if Rs. 10,000 will not be sufficient for the maintenance of an ordinary janmi family? I do not, of course, speak of the janmis who belong to the highest class of society but I speak of those janmis who come under the purview of section 5, i.e., indigent janmis who want protection. I may say, Sir, that it was at my instance that this clause was added to the Bill when it was in the Select Committee. At the same time, Sir, Mr. Narasimhacharlu does not know the conditions of Malabar

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I am glad I never entered Malabar, Sir. Otherwise the contagion will catch me of bringing such measures." (Laughter.)

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON :—"We are also glad that he has not been there. Now, Sir, 100 acres of land in Malabar will yield an income of Rs. 10,000. But a janmi holding 10 acres will get an income of about 1,000 paras of paddy according to the rates mentioned by me above, which means Rs. 1,000. Personally, I should think that that is a good income for an ordinary landholder. With regard to the other reasons pointed out what is the michavaram that is the second reason of Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan

\* Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—"There are many janmis in Malabar who own a thousand acres of land but who get only a small michavaram."

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON :—"It cannot be helped. Their ancestors have been so improvident as to encumber the estates to the hilt. So legislative interference is not . . . ."

\* Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—"Are kanams encumbrances? When did my hon. Friend begin to treat them as such?"

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON :—"The owners of all properties saleable or alienable have made themselves victims of their properties on account of improvidence and no legislation can help them. The object of this section is not to protect improvident janmis but to help those janmis who are not guilty of any improvidence and who own only small holdings.



27th August 1926]

[Mr. K. P. Raman Menon]

"Then, my hon. Friend referred to the opinion of my father, and I have 445  
certainly great respect for his opinions, and I bow to them. But his opinion  
does not amount to what Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan says. What he said was  
that janmis who own cultivated lands and dry lands together to the extent of  
a hundred acres ought to be excluded. He has not defined what extent of  
dry lands ought to be there, and since that is the case, I do not think  
I need bow down to that quotation. If you will please turn to the section, and  
see what is contemplated in the Act, there is absolutely nothing to support  
my hon. Friend's position. The section says:

'Nothing in this Act shall apply to the janmam lands of janmis who own on the date of  
the passing of this Act, 10 acres or less of such lands under cultivation.'

"So that the 10 acres are not inclusive of dry lands or lands not capable  
of cultivation, but 10 acres which are capable of cultivation and which are  
being cultivated, and cultivated as defined elsewhere. With reference to dry  
lands, if the House is not aware of the position of those dry lands in Malabar,  
I may mention it. Dry lands are not, as a matter of fact, usually cultivated  
every year. They cannot be regarded as lands under cultivation. They are  
cultivated once in three or four years. Once a crop of wild paddy is raised  
on the land, then there are two succeeding crops of millet and gingelly, and  
then the land is left fallow for three or four years. That is how dry land  
cultivation goes on there. Then, there are garden lands. They may be  
classed as dry lands. But we, on the other hand, class them as cultivated  
land, as land equal to paddy lands. They are so classed for revenue  
purposes and kanam purposes, so that the dry lands are not taken into  
calculation at all; and so that ten acres of cultivated land, as apart from other  
uncultivated dry lands, are quite sufficient to give the necessary protection  
which my hon. Friend wants under this Act. Hundred acres of land is out  
of all proportion to the wants of a janmi family there in Malabar, and I  
would therefore very strongly oppose this amendment."

\* **MR. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN** :—"May I ask then, Sir, whether he will  
substitute an income of Rs. 1,000 per year to 10 acres? I will be quite  
prepared then to accept it. He said that an income of Rs. 1,000 can be got  
from 10 acres. Then, why not the section be so amended as to exclude  
janmis with an income of Rs. 1,000 per annum?"

**MR. K. P. RAMAN MENON** :—"While my hon. Friend was there in the  
Select Committee, he did not ask for any such amendment, and I am not  
prepared to accept any such amendment offhand."

\* **MR. V. MADHAVA RAJA** :—"I strongly support this amendment. A  
janmi's family does not consist of one or two members only. Unfortunately,  
a family has got sometimes twenty members or more. For all these persons  
together, ten acres is not at all quite enough, as assumed in this Bill. I say  
it is really most unfortunate if a family of twenty or thirty members is left  
to get on with ten acres of land."

"Then, there are so many other encumbrances to the janmi. In the  
garden there will be buildings, and he will have to make improvements.  
After meeting the expenditure on all those items, he will hardly have  
anything left for his maintenance, if he has only ten acres. So, I would  
strongly urge this House to support the amendment of Mr. Narasimhacharlu.  
I would go to the extent of putting it as hundred acres of cultivable land."

[27th August 1926]

\* Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" A perusal of the various minutes of dissent appended to the report of the Select Committee shows that there is very strong feeling that the limit of ten acres is very low, and that it ought to be increased. There is a minute of dissent by my hon. Friend Mr. Sitarama Reddi from South Arcot and Mr. P. T. Rajan, to the effect that the limit ought to be extended to fifty acres, and one or two others have suggested hundred acres, and so forth. My hon. Friend from Cuddappah has suggested an extreme limit of hundred acres; and in view of the opposition which that motion has evoked, I would suggest to the House whether it is not reasonable that the limit of ten acres, which appears to be too low to be accepted as is evident also from the minutes of dissent, should be increased to at least twenty acres. I find other amendments, notices of which have been given, suggesting 20, 25, 30 and 50 acres. My hon. Friend Mr. Narasimhacharlu, in his eagerness to increase the limit of exemption to as much as possible, has suggested 100 acres. But in view of the divergence of opinion, I ask the hon. Mover of the Bill whether he would still stick to the limit finally settled by the Select Committee, or whether he will consent to an increase to a reasonable extent. If you permit me, Sir, I will move an amendment to this amendment to alter the figure '100' into '20'."

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" My hon. Friend himself did not express this opinion before. In fact, those amendments for 20, 25 and 50 were not at all moved."

\* Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I am taking the lowest of those figures, so that, that at least will be accepted by the Mover of the Bill."

\* Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I am not satisfied with those reasons, and I cannot accept any such amendment, Sir."

The amendment was then put and declared lost.

Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan demanded a poll and the House divided thus:—

#### Ayes.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan.               | 4. Dr. P. Subbārayan.                     |
| 2. " V. Madhava Raja.                       | 5. Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar.             |
| 3. Rao Bahadur O. M. Narayanan Nambudripad. | 6. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
|   | 7. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.     |

#### Noes.

- |                                     |                                      |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.           | 11. Mr. J. A. Saldanha.              |
| 2. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 12. " A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.       |
| 3. Mr. N. Devendrudu.               | 13. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 4. " A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.        | 14. Rao Bahadur P. Raman.            |
| 5. " L. C. Guruswami.               | 15. Mr. R. Veerian.                  |
| 6. " R. Madanagopal Nayudu.         | 16. " K. Venkatachala Padayachi.     |
| 7. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 17. " K. Uppi Sahib.                 |
| 8. Mr. C. Muttayya Mudaliyar.       | 18. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.  |
| 9. " G. Premayya.                   | 19. " J. Naganna Hegde.              |
| 10. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. |                                      |



27th August 1926]

*Neutral.*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Mr. N. E. Marjoribanks.             | 9. Mr. G. T. Boag.                              |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 10. " C. B. Cotterell.                          |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.                            | 11. Khan Bahadur Abdulla Ghatala Sahib Bahadur. |
| 4. " " A. Y. G. Campbell.                       | 12. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.                  |
| 5. " Diwan Bahadur Sir T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai. | 13. " A. Chidambara Nadar.                      |
| 6. " the Raja of Panagal.                       | 14. " K. Koti Reddi.                            |
| 7. Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar.             | 15. " K. Sitarama Reddi.                        |
| 8. Rao Bahadur V. T. Krishnama Achariyar.       | 16. " B. Ramachandra Reddi.                     |

*Ayes 7. Noes 19. Neutral 16.*

The amendment was lost.

Clause 5, as amended, was then put, passed and added to the Bill.

The House then adjourned at 5 p.m. to meet again at 11 o'clock the next day.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,  
*Secretary to the Legislative Council.*

## APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 2352 asked by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 27th August 1926, page 222 supra.]

*Statement showing the posts in the superior scale of Indian Civil Service abolished and newly created since the Reforms.*

Designation of post.	Number	
	Created.	Abolished.
Member of the Board of Revenue	...	1
District and Sessions Judges	3	...
Collectors	4*	...
Agency Commissioner	1	1
Secretaries to Board of Revenue	...	2
Collector of Salt Revenue (provisional)	1	...
Deputy Commissioners, Salt and Abkari	...	1
Deputy Secretaries to Government	2	...
Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards	1	...
Sub-Collector, I grade	...	1
Total	12	6

\* Includes two junior Secretaries to Government.